



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

09/523.132 03/10/00 OKAZAKI

Y 10873.506US0

023552
MERCHANT & GOULD PC
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402-0903

MMC2/0731

LEE, B

2817

07/31/01

5

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire Three (3) month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152 |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-17 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1; 2-10; 11-17 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☒ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☒ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☒ been received ☐ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Art Unit: 2817

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 1, line 19, should reference to "figs. 7 and 8" properly refer to ~~--fig. 8--~~ only since the subsequently described features appear only in that figure?; line 20, note that "86a-86d" should be rewritten as ~~--86a, 86b, 86e, 86d--~~ for consistency; lines 27,28,31, note that ~~--(also see fig. 7)--~~ should follow ~~"82", "83" and "84b",~~ respectively; line 28, note that ~~--(see fig. 7)--~~ should follow "85". Page 2, line 4, should "figs. 9 and 10" properly be ~~--fig. 10--~~ since the subsequently described features are labeled only in "fig. 10"? Also at page 2, line 4, note that "89a-89h" should be rewritten as ~~--89a,89b,89c,89d,89e,89f,89g,89h--~~ for consistency of description; line 7, note that ~~--and will not be further described--~~ should follow "8" for a proper characterization. Page 7, line 24, should "figs. 1 and 2" properly be ~~--fig. 2--~~ since the subsequently described features appear only in "fig. 2"? Page 7, line 25 and page 12, line 33, note that "16a-16h" should be rewritten as ~~--16a,16b,16c,16d,16e,16f,16g,16h--~~ at each occurrence. Page 8, line 16, note that ~~--as shown in figs. 1 and 2--~~ should follow "Furthermore," for a proper characterization; line 7, note that "1a-1c" should be rewritten as ~~--1a, 1b, 1c--~~. Note that for the descriptions of figs. 1,5,6,7,9,10, all labeled features therein need to be correspondingly described.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the

Art Unit: 2817

invention. The specification does not disclose embodiments showing more than one cover such that one skilled in the art is not enabled to make the invention having two or more covers.

Claims 3-7; 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims ~~3-7~~, note that it is unclear which one of the "at least one plate" is intended by the recited "said plate"

In claims ~~6,7~~, note that it is unclear which feature is intended by the recitation of "it."

In claims ~~12,13,14~~, note that it is unclear which one of the "at least one cover" is intended by the recited "said cover".

The following claims have been found objectionable for reasons set forth below:

In claims ~~1,2,11~~, third line of each claim, note that "formed" should be rewritten as --disposed--; fifth line of each claim, note that --there within-- should follow "substrate" for clarity of description.

In claim ~~2~~, last paragraph, first line, a --,-- should follow "plate".

In claims ~~2,11~~, last paragraph, first line, a --,-- should follow "mode"

In claims ~~3,5,12,14~~, note that "is made of" should be rewritten as --comprises--.

In claim ~~11~~, last paragraph, first line, note that a --,-- should follow "cover".

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2817

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim ~~X~~ is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by either Williams et al or Childs et al.

Note that each reference discloses shielding elements (e.g. elements (105,106) in Williams and elements (16) in Childs et al) ^which function to suppress spurious modes of propagation within the structure.

Claims 2,4,6,7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by either Yamamura or Torkington et al.

Both reference pertain to a mounting structure for electronic circuits which include partitioned sections. The sections are partitioned by conductive dividers whose dimensions prevent the propagation of undesired modes between sections thereof.

Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Hallford et al or Toyoshima.

Note the mode suppression lid including dielectric material enclosing the circuits within housing.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2817

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CAR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Yamamura or Torkington et al in view of Buck et al.

Buck et al discloses that disposing a superconducting filter circuit within a conductive housing would have been conventional in the art. Moreover, note that glossy strips (21) for suppressing undesired modes.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious that circuits withing the housing of either primary reference would have included superconductive filter circuits such as taught by Buck et al. Such a modification would have been an obvious substitution of equivalent circuits, especially in view of the use of housing to support such circuits, as taught by Buck et al.

Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Hallford et al or Toyoshima in view of Buck et al.


Art Unit: 2817

Similarly, it would have been obvious to have included superconductive filter circuits, such as taught by Buck et al, within the housing of Hallford et al or Toyoshima, for the same reason set forth in the preceding rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Benny Lee at telephone number (703) 308-4902.

Lee/tr

7/24/01


BENNY T. LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2817